

Re Point V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting this statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: GB 1 150 043

D2: EP 1 258 628

1. The present application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 is not novel within the meaning of Article 33 (2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (cf. Figures 1 and 2) a fuel-injection system having at least one fuel injector 30 and a first fuel-distributor line 36 which is connected to each fuel injector, and a second fuel-distributor line 43 which is connected to each fuel injector via a lance (*).

* The term "lance" is not clearly definable, so that it is generally understood to mean an elongated item; accordingly, the connection piece, having channel 42 from the second fuel-distributor line 43 to the individual fuel injector, is considered a "lance".

- 1.1 Furthermore, the fuel-distributor lines extend in parallel (Claim 2), each lance in a supply nipple (Claim 6), and each fuel injector is connected to the first fuel-distributor line via an intake (Claim 10).

2. In addition, a fuel injector according to EP-A-1 258 628 (family member of DE 10 123 867 mentioned in the application) is regarded as being prejudicial as to Claim 1 with regard to the variant having only one fuel injector.

In the valve shown in Figure 1 of D2 it is implicit that an individual supply must be available for fuel intake 16 and for auxiliary intake 40, i.e., a first and second fuel-distributor line. The second fuel-distributor line is then connected to the valve after the auxiliary 40, via a lance 47.

3. A joining of two parts by soldering as recited in Claims 3 and 4 cannot be considered to be based on inventive activity since solder connections are generally customary for one skilled in the art.
4. The special arrangement of the lance and thus the distributor lines as recited in Claim 4, is not known from the researched related art. On the basis of an arrangement according to D2 as most proximate related art, there is also no suggestion for one skilled in the art to modify such a known arrangement in a corresponding manner.
 - 4.1 The dependent Claims 7 - 10, in conjunction with such a main claim, would also satisfy the PCT criteria of Article 33(2) and (3).
 - 4.2 The same applies to a correspondingly adapted method claim 11.